

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants thank the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 2, 3, 8, 10-21, 23, 28, 29, 33, 34, and 36 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new claims have been added. Claims 1, 22, and 27 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 22, and 27.

Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 4-7, 9, 22, 24, 25, 27, 30-32, and 35 have been amended and are pending in this application. Applicants respectfully assert that no new matter has been introduced by way of these amendments: support for claim 1 may be found , for example, in Figures 3, 5, and 8 and paragraphs [0016]-[0021]; support for claim 22 may be found, for example, in Figure 4 and paragraphs [0022]-[0025]; support for claim 27 may be found, for example, in Figures 3, 5, and 8 and paragraphs [0016]-[0021] and [0108]-[0114]. Dependent claims have been amended to address antecedent basis issues resulting from the aforementioned amendments.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over U.S. Patent 6,741,853 (“Jiang”) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0039814 (“Crabtree”). Claims 2, 3, 8, 10-21, 23, 28, 29, 33, 34, and 36 have been cancelled in this reply. Thus the rejection with respect to these claims is now moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 recites, in part, incorporating a plurality of settings associated with the contextual environment used by a device into a hierarchical-ordered list of filter criteria to obtain a populated hierarchical-ordered list of filter criteria. Claim 1 further recites matching that populated list with one of a plurality of hierarchical-ordered support chains associated with one of a plurality of resources.

Applicants assert that Jiang fails to teach or suggest incorporating a plurality of settings associated with the contextual environment used by a device into a list of filter criteria to obtain a populated list of filter criteria, where the list is organized into a hierarchical order. Rather, Jiang selects a device based on content (see Jiang, col. 19, lines 26-48); accordingly, Jiang does not disclose obtaining a populated list of filter criteria for identifying content formatted for the contextual environment of a device. Applicants further assert that Jiang fails to teach or suggest matching the populated list of filter criteria with a plurality of support chains, where each of the plurality of support chains is associated with one of a plurality of resources. Rather, Jiang formats content in lieu of the device characteristics (see Jiang, col. 20, lines 35-58) before delivering the content; accordingly, Jiang does not disclose, at least, (i) storing a plurality of resources each including content formatted for a plurality of contextual environments and (ii) requiring a plurality

of support chains for facilitating the match between one of the plurality of resources and the populated list of filter criteria.

Further, Crabtree fails to teach or suggest that which Jiang lacks. Specifically, Crabtree fails to teach or suggest incorporating a plurality of settings associated with the contextual environment used by a device into a hierarchical-ordered list of filter criteria to obtain a populated hierarchical-ordered list of filter criteria. Rather, Crabtree maintains hierarchical listings of interests and associated keywords used for linking profiles of users with overlapping content; accordingly, Crabtree does not disclose obtaining a populated list of filter criteria for the delivery of content to a device using a device context-appropriate resource.

Crabtree also fails to teach or suggest matching a list of filter criteria populated using a plurality of settings with one of a plurality of support chains associated with one of a plurality of resources. Rather, Crabtree uses a hierarchy of interests for maintaining representative user profiles and for pairing profiles with overlapping interest areas. Accordingly, Crabtree does not teach the concept of storing a plurality of resources comprising content formatted for a plurality of contextual environments, and as a result would not disclose having a plurality of supporting chains associated with a plurality of resources.

In view of the above, Jiang and Crabtree, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the limitations recited in claim 1. Accordingly, amended claim 1 is patentable over Jiang in view of Crabtree. Dependent claims 4-7 and 9 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested with respect to claims 1, 4-7, and 9.

Applicants further submit that independent claims 22 and 27, which recite at least the same patentable limitations as claim 1, are patentable over Jiang in view of Crabtree for at least the same reasons. Claims depending from the independent claims 22 and 27 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested with respect to claims 22, 24-27, 30-32, and 35.

Conclusion

Applicants believe this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 03226/505001).

Dated: September 23, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Robert P. Lord/

Robert P. Lord
Registration No.: 46,479
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicants